

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-54 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 16, 32 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Conner et al (USPN 7113231; hereinafter "Conner et al."). Claims 7-11, 13-15, 17-26, 28-30, 33-35 and 38-54 are allowed.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must teach all of the elements in the claim. Moreover, "the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in...the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1, 12, 16, 32 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Conner et al. Applicants traverse these rejections.

**Claim 1**

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner contends that Conner et al. teaches all the elements of claim 1. However, claim 1 is not anticipated by Conner et al. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

a display panel which is to be viewed from N number of view points and includes a plurality of display pixels arranged in a matrix, each display pixel having M×N (M and N each represent a natural number) number of sub-pixels, said M×N number of sub-pixels included in each of said display pixels being formed within a square area; and

a lenticular lens for distributing light rays from said sub-pixels individually to said view points.

The Examiner points to Figs 1 and 5 and col. 7, lines 26-34 as allegedly teaching claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Conner et al. is directed to a color display system with a light source, two gratings, a microlens array, an Liquid Crystal Display (LCD), a wobbler, a projection lens and a display screen. Conner et al. discloses the first grating to separate the white light into distinct color components which passes through the microlens array which focuses the light onto the LCD. Conner et al. discloses the light passing through the wobbler to the projection lens and finally reaching the display screen (col. 5, lns. 2-24). Conner et al. also discloses “times t1, t2, and t3 during which portions of all three color component planes (54) are delivered to display device (58) during one image frame” (col. 5, lns. 27-29).

However, Conner et al. is silent on a  $M \times N$  number of sub-pixels included in a display pixel which is formed within a **square area**, and a **lenticular lens** for distributing light rays from the sub-pixels individually to  $N$  number of view points. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Conner et al. fails to teach or suggest “ $M \times N$  number of sub-pixels included in each of said display pixels being formed within a square area, and a lenticular lens for distributing light rays from said sub-pixels individually to said view points.”

In view of the above, claim 1 is not anticipated by Conner et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-6, 12, 16, 27, 31, 32, 36, 37, 41, 42 and 46 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependencies on claim 1.

**Allowable Subject Matter**


Claims 2-6, 27 and 31 are objected to as allegedly being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner hold in abeyance such rewriting until the Examiner has had an opportunity to reconsider (and withdraw) the prior art rejection of the other claims.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Warren Lytle, Jr.  
Registration No. 39,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 3, 2008